

JENNIFER STISA GRANICK (SBN 168423)  
jennifer@law.stanford.edu  
RIANA PFEFFERKORN (SBN 266817)  
riana@law.stanford.edu  
559 Nathan Abbott Way  
Stanford, California 94305-8610  
Telephone: (650) 736-8675  
Facsimile: (650) 725-4086

*Pro Se* Petitioners

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
**OAKLAND DIVISION**

**IN RE:**  
**PETITION OF JENNIFER GRANICK AND**  
**RIANA PFEFFERKORN TO UNSEAL**  
**TECHNICAL-ASSISTANCE ORDERS AND**  
**MATERIALS**

MISC. CASE NO.: 16-mc-80206-KAW

**SECOND DECLARATION OF RIANA**  
**PFEFFERKORN IN SUPPORT OF**  
**PETITION TO UNSEAL TECHNICAL-**  
**ASSISTANCE ORDERS AND**  
**MATERIALS**

1 I, Riana Pfefferkorn, declare as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law before this Court. I am the Cryptography  
3 Fellow at the Center for Internet and Society at Stanford Law School (“CIS”), and am one of the  
4 *pro se* Petitioners in the above-captioned matter. The following facts are true to the best of my  
5 knowledge and belief and, if called and sworn as a witness, I could and would testify  
6 competently to them.

7 2. I make this Second Declaration in order to amend my Declaration of September  
8 28, 2016, filed in support of the above-captioned Petition at Docket Item (“D.I.”) 3.

9 3. I made my September 28th Declaration on the basis of a September 16, 2016  
10 telephone conversation I had with Mr. Mark Jenkins, Deputy Clerk of this Court, regarding how  
11 this Court keeps track of search warrants and surveillance authorization orders, such as wiretap  
12 or pen register/trap-and-trace orders. I understood Mr. Jenkins to say that the Court does not  
13 assign these matters case numbers nor docket them.

14 4. I subsequently learned that the Court does assign case numbers and docket  
15 surveillance matters, even when sealed.

16 5. On December 19, 2016, I called Mr. Jenkins again to follow up on our prior  
17 conversation and confirm my understanding. During this call, Mr. Jenkins stated that warrants  
18 and surveillance matters filed in this District are in fact assigned case numbers, but the  
19 documents themselves are not entered into CM/ECF. He further stated that the Clerk’s office can  
20 search for these matters by case number, but that there is otherwise no way to search them.

21 6. Mr. Jenkins further stated that when such a matter is unsealed by the Court, the  
22 documents are still not entered into CM/ECF, but they are available to be viewed at the Clerk’s  
23 office. Mr. Jenkins told me that he believes this Court began using CM/ECF around 2006, and  
24 that cases that had already been closed prior to that time were not entered into CM/ECF.

25 7. On information and belief, this Court generally assigns the “criminal  
26 miscellaneous” (“xr”) case type to applications for warrants and surveillance orders.

27 8. Based on this new information and my second conversation with Mr. Jenkins, the  
28 following statements in my Declaration of September 28, 2016 were inaccurate: in paragraph 3,

1 “[warrants and surveillance orders] are not assigned a case number of any means to look them  
2 up, and they are not searchable”; in paragraph 4, “the Clerk’s office does not keep track of these  
3 materials”; and the first sentence of paragraph 5, “Mr. Jenkins reiterated that these materials are  
4 not searchable and that in order to locate a specific surveillance order, someone in the Clerk’s  
5 office would have to review all the paper records of such materials one by one, potentially using  
6 a date range to narrow it down.”

7 I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States that the foregoing is  
8 true and correct. Executed at San Francisco, California on December 22, 2016.

9  
10 *Riana Pfefferkorn*

11 \_\_\_\_\_  
Riana Pfefferkorn  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28